



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

as an official record of success. The vase might then pass down in families as an heirloom, a fact which seems to be illustrated by the representation of an amphora in a mosaic at Delos (*Annual of the British School* III, Pl. 16). The discussion of the athletic scenes on the reverse of the vases is a useful part of the treatise, and so too are the closing pages on the type of the representation of Athena. The author is an advocate of the view that there were two early statuesque types of Athena, which were objects of religious cultus, one a peaceful, seated figure, the Polias, the other warlike in type. This latter type, as an object of religious worship in sanctuaries, he finds represented on several early vases, and believes that it assumes the essential form of the Athena of the Panathenaic vases during the era of Peisistratus, who would appropriately have placed such a statue in his Hecatompedon. The suggestion is worth making, even if it be a matter not susceptible of proof.

As a whole the book is good, but it should have been given indices. This is an unfortunate omission in such a work. To No. 89, p. 56, the place of publication (*Classical Review*, 1900, p. 475) should have been added. This number is an inscribed fragment which Professor Tarbell published, and it should be referred to in Dr. Brauchitsch's discussion of the inscriptions on p. 123, since it gives an example of a *kionedon* inscription between the dates of the archons Polyzelus and Themistocles, and shows that No. 83 is not the only specimen before the archon Pythodelus upon which an inscription (the archon's in the case of No. 89) is placed outside of a column. Professor Tarbell (*Classical Review*, *loc. cit.*) has shown further that the fragments from the archonship of Themistocles (Nos. 90, 91) are inscribed in the same way, and that they were misunderstood when published.

J. R. WHEELER

Vetii Valentis Anthologiarum Libri. Primum edidit GUILELMUS KROLL. Berlin: Weidmann, 1908. Pp. i-xvii; 1-420. M. 16.

The existence of the astrological work of Vettius Valens has long been known to modern scholars, but although it was used by Scaliger, Salmasius, and others, it has remained unedited until the present day. Some years since at Usener's suggestion Ernest Riess undertook to prepare an edition, but finally abandoned his plan and placed the material he had gathered at the disposal of Wilhelm Kroll, who has now given us an admirable *editio princeps*, such as only a sound classical philologist, well versed in ancient astrology, could prepare. The text rests primarily on a Codex Vaticanus Gr. 191 of the fourteenth century, whose present gaps are supplied by a Selden manuscript in Oxford, which was copied from the Vaticanus in the sixteenth century; for Books I and II a Codex Marcianus 314 of the fourteenth century is also of value. Yet in all a

considerable portion has been lost at the beginning which must have included the *προτρεπτικοὶ λόγοι* of which Valens speaks at the opening of the second book.

Our knowledge of Valens is derived almost wholly from his work. We learn that he was poor and forced to travel in search of a livelihood, which he gained both by casting horoscopes and by inducting others into the noble science of astrology; indeed he composed his work for the advantage of his pupils, to one of whom, a certain Marcus, it is addressed. Although in the superscription the author is called *Οὐέττιος Οὐάλης Ἀντιοχεῖς*, he clearly derived his learning from Egypt, for he employs the Egyptian names of the months and reckons time according to the Alexandrians, and in one passage states that he traveled in Egypt (p. 172, 3ff. *ἡμεῖς δὲ πολλὴν μὲν χώραν διοδεύσαντες καὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον διελθόντες κτλ.*). Valens made no claim to originality; he proposed to provide his pupils with a clear account of the learning of the ancients, and therefore called his work *ἀνθολογία*. Unhappily, however, he was not equal to the task of digesting his sources and arranging his material satisfactorily in chapters as he wished to do; at times in confusion he introduces conflicting doctrines and repeats himself. In one passage (p. 157, 28-33) he shows that he was himself conscious that his work was not perfect, and asks for his readers' indulgence on the ground of his infirmities. But the defects of his work did not prevent it from exerting great influence on astrological writers from the fourth to the sixteenth century.

Kroll is probably right in assigning Valens to the age of the Antonines. The dates which he gives in his examples of geniturea vary from the first year of Nero's reign to the twentieth of that of Antoninus Pius, but most fall within Hadrian's reign. This fact Kroll interprets to mean that the majority of those who applied to Valens for horoscopes were born under Hadrian; he therefore places the floruit of Valens in the reign of Antoninus Pius, and regards the passage at the close of chap. xix of Book I, in which the list of the emperors is carried down to Gordianus and Philip, as an addition to the original work. It should be noted, however, that in general there is much in the language which may point to the third or even the fourth century, and that it is wholly possible, if not indeed probable, that the work has suffered additions and revisions which cannot today be readily detected. The study of the language, which has been promised by one of Kroll's pupils, may show some of the strata which probably exist; in any case it should contribute much to our knowledge of the later colloquial *κοινή*, for the speech which Valens employed was that of the people and far removed from the literary language.

The publication of this work adds much to our knowledge of ancient astronomy and astrology. In the latter we today have little interest, but still we must be grateful for the new light which Valens throws on

the civilization of his age. Future studies in the subject-matter of his work will undoubtedly enucleate valuable additions to our acquaintance with the second century.

CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Poeti Latini Minor, testo critico commentato da Gaetano Curcio.

Vol. II, fasc. 2, *Appendix Vergiliana*, "Dirae," "Lydia," "Ciris." Catania: Francesco Battiato editore, 1908. 8vo, pp. 196.

The second fascicle of the *Appendix Vergiliana* follows the general plan of the first, containing the "Priapea," "Catalepton," "Copa," "Moretum," published in 1905. The appearance in 1907 of the critical edition by Robinson Ellis of the *Appendix Vergiliana* lends a special interest to the problems of the text, and naturally suggests a comparison of the two works from this point of view. There is no evidence that C. had made any use of Ellis' edition, or had even seen it, and the work of the two scholars is therefore independent. For the "Ciris" they are on common ground, and make use of the same MSS; but in the "Dirae" and the "Lydia" the divergence is little short of remarkable. Of the six MSS used by Curcio, and the ten used by Ellis, they have only two in common, viz., Vat. 3252, s. ix (B), and Vat. 3269, s. xv (designated as A by Curcio and as v by Ellis). In addition to these Curcio has used the following, all Italian, collated by himself: Vat. 1586, s. xv (C), Vat. Urb. 350 (D), Laurentianus 33, 31, s. xiv (L), containing scholia on the "Dirae," and Laurentianus 39, 18, s. xv. (L¹). In addition to the two MSS already mentioned Ellis made use of the readings of the following: Paris. 7927, s. x (P), Paris. 8093, s. x (E), Paris. 17177, s. xi (S=Stabulense fragmentum), Bodl. Auct. F. 1, 17, s. xiv (F), Harl. 3963, s. xv (h), Mus. Brit. 16562, script. A.D. 1400 (b), Monacensis. 18059, s. xi (T), Mellicensis, s. xi (M). It is difficult to see on what principle Curcio selected his MSS, other than their convenient location in Italy. A glance at his critical apparatus is sufficient to show that, of his six MSS, all Italian, the last five ACDLL¹ are closely related to each other and to b of Ellis' list, and are clearly descended from a common ancestor of a relatively late date. Their consensus alone has real value. His apparatus, therefore, compared with that of Ellis is one-sided and defective. Ellis, on the other hand, gives from the family bACDLL¹, just mentioned, the readings of b A, which are fairly representative of the group, and the following MSS of the eleventh century or earlier, TMSPE, of considerable independent value. Although Curcio's apparatus is not representative, his collations of D C L L¹ have been made with care and will be useful to students of the "Dirae" and "Lydia." In dealing with the text of the three poems Curcio has been on the whole conservative